

Personnel Board
Library Trustees Room
Monday, April 22, 2013 @ 7:30 PM

Meeting Minutes:

S. Crown moved to accept the minutes of the March 11, 2013 Personnel Board Meeting, seconded by E. Richter, Vote: 5-0.

J. King moved to accept the minutes of the March 18, 2013 Personnel Board Meeting as amended, seconded by S. Crown, Vote: 5-0. J. King requested that the minutes be amended to clarify the confusion around which department the grieving employee reported to; as this was pertinent to the employee's position in filing the grievance. The minutes will be amended to reflect the conversation during the March 18, 2013 meeting relating to the confusion around the role and where the position reported.

Old Business

Salary Adjustment Requests

Treasurer/Collector: The Town Administrator said it's the trial time in the job and the success in the job. The current salary is \$66,950, \$70,000 is being requested; a 4.5% increase. This request is based on merit. T. Delaney thought this was an agreed upon step at the time of hire. The employee was hired two years ago, the expectation was that a review would occur and it didn't.

The Town Administrator said she doesn't hire new employees in at the highest rate possible. She likes to be sure that the individuals can do the job and do it well, then increase the salary accordingly.

E. Richter stated that this should be built in under, Recruitment, Article 8, Section 1, E and F, probationary period for future hiring.

T. Delaney moved to increase the Treasurer/Collector's salary to \$70,000 and the Asst. Treasurer Collector to \$44,000 per the recommendation of the town administrator, effective 7/1/13, D. Kearns seconded the motion, Vote: 5-0.

Assistant Treasurer/Collector - see above

Assistant to the Town Administrator: The request is to increase the salary from \$52,780 to \$60,000; this is a market adjustment request. E. Richter said the issues to be considered are knowledge, skills and ability and does the employee function independently; do they have supervisory responsibilities. It sounds comparable to the DPW field coordinator and the IT manager.

T. Delaney moved to approve the market adjustment for the Asst. to the Town Administrator to \$60,000 effective 7/1/13 for reason of market equity, seconded by King, Vote: 5-0.

Sr. Administrative Assistant Board of Selectmen: This request is for internal parity. Currently the position is at \$39,200, the request is to increase it to \$42,000; a 5.5% increase. This is compared to \$41,000 for a comparable position at the Police Station.

T. Delaney moved to approve the request to increase the salary for the Board of Selectmen Senior Administrative Asst. to \$42,000 effective 7/1/13, for reasons of parity, seconded by D. Kearns, Vote: 5-0.

S. Crown moved that the title at the police station be changed to Senior Administrative Asst., seconded by J. King for reasons of parity, Vote: 5-0.

Assistant Town Clerk: Town Clerk, Pat Brown, was in attendance. The Town Administrator distributed a spreadsheet indicating comparable Asst. Town Clerk salaries. The spreadsheet indicated that the median is \$46,376, the existing salary is \$40,660, the request is \$44,600; over an 8% increase. \$41,270 is the existing approved budget. P. Brown stated that the Asst. Town Clerk has been with the town for over 20 years. She continued that what is the most critical thing for the position is versatility; the individual must know everything there is to know about the town. She stated the L. Emerson can answer virtually any question that comes in (assessing, treasurers, voters, town government, etc.). T. Delaney questioned why this request is being made now and didn't the recent D. Jacobs process take care of this. T. Delaney is uncomfortable with this process without internal consistency. He is worried about the procedures and policies; would like to get them nailed down. D. Kearns said that D. Jacobs performed the salary study; it was the town's job to be sure the town positions were in the correct category. The Town Administrator stated that the D. Jacobs process did not change any employee's salary. S. Crown questioned if a manager can come at any time throughout the year and request a salary increase. She continued that without common review dates, it can become a piling on process.

Without the salary study, there were regular increases for everyone, but individual managers were not coming in for salary increases for their staff. There was a whole process behind the classification; then there was the pay study.

E. Richter said there are five criteria; (adding temporary responsibilities, career advancement, internal parity, market equity, meeting expectations) these are the objective things that we're hanging our hats on. If we can't answer those five criteria, then we shouldn't be granting the increase.

Pat Brown said there are similarities to other positions in town, but no internal comparisons.

J. King we're not talking about the individual but we're talking about policy and implementation of the policy.

D. Kearns inquired about the averages for the D. Jacobs survey and commented that if Gloucester salaries were excluded from the survey, the ranges would be closer. Even with Gloucester in, the range is close to \$40,000. S. Crown commented that although Gloucester and Rockport are not comparable communities in many ways, the proximity needs to be considered.

This will be deferred to the next meeting pending more research.

New Business

Annual Town Meeting: increased merit bonus pool was approved at Town Meeting.

Other Business:

The filling of the Accounting Support Specialist has been approved; the recruitment process will begin. It was decided that S. Crown, Personnel Board member, will participate in the interview process for this full time position.

Salary administration policy and recruitment policy should be on the agenda for the next meeting if time permits.

9:40 pm, T. Delaney moved to adjourn, seconded by J. King, Vote: 5-0.

Next Meeting: Monday, May 13, 2013 at 7:30 pm in Conference Room A, Town Hall.